

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/617,910	ELLIOTT, GILLIAN DAPHNE
	Examiner Zachariah Lucas	Art Unit 1648

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) Zachariah Lucas.

(3) _____.

(2) Susan Alpert Siegel, PhD.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 17 January 2006

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

NA

Claims discussed:

12

Prior art documents discussed:

NA


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was indicated that the claims would be in condition for allowance if claim 12 was amended to clarify that the VP22 protein (or fragment thereof) was physically connected to the substance to be delivered. It was suggested that the claim be amended to replace the phrase "and a non-covalent association" in line 3 of the claim with the phrase - - and a non-covalent coupling- -. The Applicant agreed to the amendment and indicated that an Examiner's amendment making this change would be acceptable. .